## UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT EASTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN SOUTHERN DIVISION

JOSHUA J. BURKE,

| Plaintiff,                 |   | Case No. 2:24-cv-11632                                      |
|----------------------------|---|---|
| v.<br>LENAWEE COUNTY JAIL, |   | Honorable Susan K. DeClercq<br>United States District Judge |
| Defendant.                 | / |   |

## ORDER DISMISSING CASE *SUA SPONTE* FOR FAILURE TO PROSECUTE AND FAILURE TO PAY FILING FEES

Plaintiff Joshua Burke filed this lawsuit and sought permission to proceed without prepaying to do so. But his application demonstrated that he could afford to pay the filing fee yet had not paid, so he was directed to pay the fees. ECF No. 5 (citing *Boussum v. Washington*, 649 F. Supp. 3d 525, 529 (E.D. Mich.), *recons. denied*, 655 F. Supp. 3d 636 (E.D. Mich. 2023)). Plaintiff was also explicitly told that if he failed to pay the fees, then his complaint would be dismissed under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(b), (e)(2)(A) and Civil Rule 41(b) for failure to prosecute. *Id.* Plaintiff's deadline was August 1, 2024. *See* FED. R. CIV. P. 6(d).

He has not prepaid the fees or properly requested an exemption. Therefore, this Court must presume that he is proceeding without prepayment, assess the whole fee, and dismiss the case for failure to prosecute. *McGore v. Wrigglesworth*, 114

F.3d 601, 605 (6th Cir. 1997), overruled on other grounds by Jones v. Bock, 549

U.S. 199, 203 (2007). "If the case is dismissed under these circumstances, it is not

to be reinstated to the district court's active docket"—even if the plaintiff attempts

to pay the filing fees. *Id.*; see also Baxter v. Rose, 305 F.3d 486, 489 (6th Cir. 2002)

(holding that *McGore* applies "where the district court dismisses cases *sua sponte* 

under 28 U.S.C. § 1915A"), abrogated on other grounds by Jones, 549 U.S. 199;

see also Redd v. Redmon, 215 F.3d 1327 (6th Cir. 2000) (unpublished table decision)

(same for cases dismissed "under § 1915(e)(2)(A)"); Boussum v. Washington, 655

F. Supp. 3d 636, 642 (E.D. Mich. 2023) (same for cases dismissed under 28 U.S.C.

§ 1915(b)).

Accordingly, it is **ORDERED** that Plaintiff's Complaint, ECF No. 1, is

**DISMISSED**. See 28 U.S.C. § 1915(b), (e)(2)(A); FED. R. CIV. P. 41(b).

Further, it is **ORDERED** that the Complaint is **PROHIBITED** from being

reinstated to the district court's active docket—even if Plaintiff pays the filing fees.

Further, it is **ORDERED** that Plaintiff is **DENIED** leave to proceed in forma

pauperis on appeal. See 28 U.S.C. § 1915(a)(3).

This order closes the above-captioned case.

/s/Susan K. DeClercq SUSAN K. DeCLERCO

United States District Judge

Dated: 8/2/2024

- 2 -